

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

NO. 24-CR-10259-DJC

v.

MATTHEW FARWELL,  
Defendant.

ORDER ON EXCLUDABLE DELAY

KELLEY, U.S.M.J.

Defendant had an interim status conference scheduled for December 3, 2024. The parties filed a joint status report outlining the discovery that the government has provided and asking that an interim status conference be scheduled in about 60 days. (#29.) The status conference on December 3, 2024 is cancelled and a further interim status conference is scheduled for February 4, 2025 at 10:45 a.m. **in person.**

With the assent of the parties, the Court finds that the interests of justice in this case, *i.e.*, to allow defendant time to prepare the case for trial or other disposition, outweigh the best interests of the public and defendant for a trial within seventy days of the date of indictment. Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), the Clerk of this Court enter excludable time for the period from December 3, 2024, up to and including February 4, 2025.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties are hereby advised that under the provisions of Rule 2(b) of the Rules for United States Magistrates in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, any party may move for reconsideration by a district judge of the determination(s) and order(s) set forth herein within fourteen (14) days after receipt of a copy of this order, unless a different time is prescribed by this court or the district

/s/ M. Page Kelley  
M. PAGE KELLEY  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

judge. The party seeking reconsideration shall file with the Clerk of this Court, and serve upon all parties, a written notice of the motion which shall specifically designate the order or part thereof to be reconsidered and the basis for the objection thereto. The district judge, upon timely motion, shall reconsider the magistrate judge's order and set aside any portion thereof found to be clearly erroneous in fact or contrary to law. The parties are further advised that the United States Court of Appeals for this Circuit has indicated that failure to comply with this rule shall preclude further appellate review. See Phinney v. Wentworth Douglas Hospital, 199 F.3d 1 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1999); Sunview Condo. Ass'n v. Flexel Int'l, 116 F.3d 962 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1997); Pagano v. Frank, 983 F.2d 343 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1993).